



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

since the chapter went to press, we still find some important items lacking. The bibliography for "The Puritan Attack upon the Stage" seems excellent, but I note the omission of Crosse's *Virtue's Commonwealth*.

Most of us have learned to be charitable in regard to typographical errors, but it must be said that a surprising number have escaped the proofreaders in these two volumes. The list of *errata* corrected for the fifth volume is a large one, and yet in the two volumes I have noted at least forty others. Errors are especially numerous in the bibliographies, where misspelled proper names and incorrect initials are frequent. It may be worth while to note some misprinted dates. Vol. V, p. 114, l. 33, 1638 should read 1538; p. 348, n. 1, 1560 should read 1580, the date of *The Third Blast of Retreat from Plays and Theatres*; p. 528, l. 27, 1809 should read 1909; Vol. VI, p. 317, l. 15, 485 should read 1485; p. 331, l. 19, 1582 should read 1482; p. 356, l. 38, 1506 should read 1605; p. 442, l. 14, 1528 should read 1582, the date of Gosson's *Playes confuted in five Actions*. The following examples of errors in titles and proper names may be noted: Vol. V, p. 425 (under Collier), *The Three Triumphs of Love and Fortune*, and p. 552, *Rare Thoughts of Love and Fortune*, should read *The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune*; p. 434 (under C) *Dux Morand* should read *Dux Moraud*; p. 447, l. 31, Gandina should read Caudina according to Prof. Cunliffe's reprint in *Mod. Lang. Pub.*, March, 1911; Vol. VI, p. 35, l. 18, *Ovid's Banquet of Sauce* should read *Ovid's Banquet of Sense*; p. 279, l. 18, Nowell should read Knowell.

The University of Chicago.

C. R. BASKERVILL.

STUDIER I BEOWULFSAGAN.....af Henrik Schück,
Upsala, 1909.

In this monograph Professor Henrik Schück of the University of Upsala presents the theory that the *Beowulf* was composed in Friesland by an English traveller, whose literary materials comprised two saga cycles, the one consisting of Danish stories told by Danes, the other, of Geatish stories told by Geats. Professor Schück also makes the conjecture that the name Beowulf resulted from a combination of the names of two heroes, Beow and Wulf.

Schück's argument is based on an examination of the figure of the hero, the fundamental motifs, and the episodes and allusions in the poem. The disparity in age between the young warrior of the Grendel exploit and the venerable king of the dragon fight leads him to assume that the Beowulf-

material up to the time of the Anglo-Saxon poet had celebrated two different heroes. He further argues that early in the development of the saga the Grendel-Grendelin portion had existed as two separate parts with separate heroes.

I

In order to prove the separate existence of the three fundamental stories in the poem, Schück reduces each to its simple motif and proceeds to find parallels to this in the popular literature of the North. The motif underlying the Grendel episode had its ultimate source in popular superstition and may be formulated as follows: A demon infests a dwelling or land, and is slain by a chieftain or hero, whereupon the dwelling or land becomes habitable. This motif appears as a local tale ("lokalsägen") in the Glam episode of the *Grettissaga*; as a burlesque folk-tale in Grimm's *Kinder- und Haus-Märchen*, No. 4; as a saga of heroic tinge in the story of Arnljót Gellini as told by Snorri¹ and as a pure heroic saga in Beowulf. In the *Grettissaga* the ghost of Glam haunts a farmyard killing livestock as well as the occupants of the house. Grettir comes and keeps watch alone in the house. A fight so violent that it almost wrecks the house ensues, and Glam is slain, after which the house is no longer haunted.

In the German story a youth wins a princess by occupying a haunted castle three nights. The first night he outwits and kills two huge black cats. The second night a number of horrible individuals appear and play nine-pins with skulls and bones. The youth is cool enough to join in the game until the stroke of twelve, when the evil spirits vanish. During the third night a coffin containing a corpse is brought in. The youth places the corpse near the fire, where it comes to life and attacks him, but is finally overpowered. Next a man with a long white beard appears, who engages the youth in a combat, but is overcome and escapes only by confiding the whereabouts of a treasure. After these exploits the castle is no longer haunted.

In the Arnljót story, as related by Snorri, twelve merchants sleeping in a hall are attacked by a witch. She slays eleven of the twelve. The last man calls for help and is rescued by Arnljót and his retinue, who occupy the loft. The witch then begins to devour the dead men but is interrupted by Arnljót, who pierces her between the shoulders with his spear. She flees with the spear transfixed in her body.

In Beowulf a new development of the motif is illustrated, for here it is closely connected with history. And this historical localization at Hrothgar's court could have been given

¹ Ed Unger, pp. 406 seq.

the motif only in Denmark. The hero, although a Geat in the poem, was not necessarily so in the saga. It was sufficient that he be some stranger.

It is to be kept in mind that Schück does not believe there are any literary relations between the various parallels here mentioned. He holds that these are different poetical expressions of the same processes of primitive imagination.

The motif of the dragon fight is that the hero kills a dragon but dies of the wounds received in the struggle. The parallels to this go back to the earliest and most widespread expression of popular superstition. Death was often imagined as a devouring monster. A relic of this belief is the Hell-Mouth of the miracle plays. This belief forms the basis for many a story. In a Danish tale a wolf attacks a shepherd boy, and devours his sheep, his colt, the boy himself, the master and his wife, and finally the dog and the cat. But the two pets fall to fighting so fiercely that the wolf's belly is ripped open, whereupon the whole company gets out and slays the wolf. Again, in a Norse saga, a prince is in search of a bride as red as blood and as white as snow. After passing through the jaws of a wolf and later through the jaws of a bear, he reaches a meadow where he finds the princess. On their return to the jaws of the bear he bids the lady close her eyes, whereupon he draws her through. In Norse mythology the death monster is represented by the wolf Fenris, the hound Garm, the serpent Nidhogg, and the Midgard serpent.

Schück divides sagas about the death monster into two groups. In the first, the monster is slain by a hero or god who descends into the bowels of the beast to free the men or animals previously devoured. In the second group, the hero is killed and devoured by the monster, but his death is avenged by a second hero who enters the death monster and liberates his predecessor. For example, Fenrir devours Odin but the deed is avenged by Vidar. In the heroic saga of the Hartungs, Hartnit is devoured by a monster, but his fate is avenged by Hardheri. The dragon fight in Beowulf belongs to this second group. The original primitive motif has, however, become partly rationalized. The hero is not devoured, and, although dying, is partly his own avenger. The second hero has been subordinated and appears only as giving timely aid to the first hero. Originally Beowulf's fight with the dragon and Wiglaf's attack upon the monster were doubtless separate, though related, events. The combination was, of course, made very early. However that may be, it is important to observe that the dragon-exploit has been assigned to a Geat hero. And this could have happened only among the Geats.

Thus, considering the nationalities of the two main episodes in *Beowulf*, it seems most likely that the Grendel-saga as such took final form in Denmark and the dragon-saga in Geatland. Further, an examination of the Grendelin episode in itself indicates that the final stage of its growth took place in Denmark. The action is really a variation of the Grendel motif, resembling incidents in the *Grettissaga* (Chaps. 64-67), and in the *Ormssaga*. Schück's summary of resemblances must be given in full.

1. It is significant that the demons in both cases are mother and son. In the *Grettissaga* the hall is first haunted by a giantess. She is overcome, whereupon Grettir enters the lair and slays the giant. That the two beings are mother and son is to be inferred from the parallel in the *Ormssaga*.

2. More significant are the two combats. Both in *Beowulf* and in the *Grettissaga* the first combat takes place in the hall and the second in the lair. In the *Ormssaga*, to be sure, the two combats are fought in the lair. But there has evidently been a combination with the haunted house motif, for the witch first visits the tent of Asbjörn, where she slays twenty men.

3. In the combat with Beowulf Grendel loses his arm, a characteristic detail paralleled by the fact that Grettir cuts off the witch's arm.

4. The scene of the final fight is characteristic. Beowulf dives to the bottom of the pool, and is drawn into a fire-lighted den into which the water cannot come. In the *Grettissaga* the den, lighted by fire, is behind a waterfall above the surface of the water. In the *Ormssaga* the den is situated above the water.

5. Another detail is also characteristic. In *Beowulf*, when the Danes see the water stained with blood, they depart, believing that Beowulf has been vanquished. In the *Grettissaga* the priest, seeing the bloody entrails on the water's surface, believes Grettir dead, and leaves the spot.

6. The parallel of the swords is less definite. Beowulf's own sword, the *hæft-mece*,¹ is unavailing against Grendel's mother. But he finds another sword in the lair and with it kills his antagonist. A similar sword plays a part in the *Grettissaga*, but there is a variation from the original motif, which seems to have been that a demon could be slain by only one particular sword. The giant's sword is called a *hepti-sax*. It is the giant who, when his own *hepti-sax* becomes useless, reaches for another sword in the den. In the *Orms-*

¹ Schück translates *hæft-mece* and *hepti-sax* both as "shaft-sword, or a sword with a curious wooden shaft, or hilt."

saga the sword motif has been displaced by the magic gloves with which the hero overcomes his opponent.

7. At the beginning of the second episode in *Beowulf*, Grendel's mother carries off Aeschere, Hrothgar's dearest friend. This loss is avenged by Beowulf. In the *Ormssaga*, Asdbjörn first enters the lair and is killed, whereupon his comrade Orm avenges his death. This is the original motif, namely, that a hero is devoured by a monster of death but is avenged by his fosterbrother. *Beowulf* preserves merely the relic of this motif, for Aeschere is the dearest friend of Hrothgar, not of Beowulf. The *Grettissaga* does not contain this parallel.

From the above comparisons Schück concludes that the first two episodes of *Beowulf* were combined before the material reached the Anglo Saxon poet. For the existence of two demons in the Anglo-Saxon poem, as well as in the Icelandic sagas shows clearly that the combination of two fundamental motifs was made in the common source of these various stories. In regard to the literary relations of the *Beowulf* and the Icelandic sagas, the author accepts Vigfusson's theory in the main, namely, that "the old legend shot forth from its ancient Scandinavian home into two branches," one terminating in the English epic, the other in Icelandic popular saga.

II.

If the epic is made up of three different stories there must originally have been three different heroes, or at least two of them, the hero of the demons and the hero of the dragon. It is to be observed that the name "Beowulf" is used for two different persons, one, the dimly delineated son of Scyld, and the other our hero. In a West Saxon genealogy we find Beow, the son of Scyld, and in the Anglo Saxon Chronicle Beaw, the son of Sceldwa. This Beaw, or Beow, seems to be identical with Beowulf, the son of Scyld in the epic. Now in endeavoring to discover the three heroes, one of two assumptions must be made, either that one hero was Beowulf and that the others have been forgotten, or that Beowulf combines the names of two heroes. The latter assumption is favored by the fact that the name Beow already exists outside of the epic. Of which story was Beow the hero, then? Clearly of the Grendel story, which is Danish in setting and in characters.

Then who was the hero of the dragon fight? It is a significant fact that the royal Scandinavian families were fond of alliterating names. The Danes were Healfdene, Heorogar, Hrothgar, Halga; Heorowearð; Hrethric, Hrothmund; and Hrothulf. The Swedes were Ongentheow; Ohtere, Onela; Eanmund and Eadgils. The Geats were Hrethel; Herebeald,

Haethcyn, Hygelac; and Heardred. Now we learn from the poem that the dragon hero was a Waegmunding. We also know that Weohstan and Wiglaf were his kinsmen. Applying the principle of alliteration, the name of the dragon hero should begin with the letter W. Perhaps it was Wulf, or Wulf plus another syllable. The conjecture is supported by the existence of the Wylfingas, or Ylfingas. Their founder must have been Wylf or Wulf. And the dragon hero may be identical with this same Wulf.

It now remains to find the hero of the third story, the fight with the sea monster. The poem calls Beowulf Ecgtheow's son. But Beow's father was Scyld, and Wulf's father was a Waegmunding, and in that house the names seem to alliterate on the letter w. Consequently Ecgtheow's son was a third person, doubtless the Grendelin hero. The three heroes were naively and crudely combined and thus we get "Beowulf, Ecgtheow's son."¹

III.

Schück's theory that the first part of the *Beowulf* is Danish saga material and that the second part is Geatish, is supported by his observation that the minor episodes of the first part are practically all Danish, and those of the second part, are practically all Geatish.

It is significant that the second part of the poem contains only two brief allusions to Beowulf's Grendel exploit (2351-4; 2521). These are not organic and might have been inserted by the poet. The remaining episodes concern three different traditions; first, the Geats' raid into Friesland; second, a fratricide in the Geatish royal family; and, third, the Geatish-Swedish wars. Hygelac's raid into Friesland is historical and took place about 512. According to the poem Beowulf accompanied Hygelac and escaped by a remarkable feat of swimming. The second part of the poem mentions this raid in three different places. There is a slight allusion to it in the first part with reference to the Brising collar, but this is only casual and may have been an insertion by the poet. That Beowulf did not actually participate in this raid is to be inferred from the fact that he is not a historical figure. It

¹ The reader will, perhaps, observe some weakness in these arguments. Professor Schück has already said that the Grendel and Grendelin portions were combined early in the development of the saga. Was the hero then at that time called Beow, Ecgtheow's son if Beow was generally known as the son of Scyld? Furthermore, if Scyld's son slew Grendel at Hrothgar's hall, we shall have to explain how saga motif have combined with historical setting so as to form a new saga in which a grandfather cleansed the hall of his grandson. At any rate the poem makes it clear that Hrothgar was not the younger of the two men.

must have taken some time to connect the saga hero, a dragon-killer, with the historical tradition of Hygelac. The raid is described from a Geatish point of view and consequently the saga is Geatish.

Haethcyn's accidental slaying of his brother Herebeald is somewhat confusing as it stands in *Beowulf*. We get the impression (2450-2457) that Hrethel is left childless, while as a matter of fact he still has Hygelac as well as Haethcyn. This inconsistency probably indicates that originally there were only two brothers and that the surviving one had been put to death in retribution for the accident. However this is to be explained, the saga, because of its historical character, is Geatish in origin.

The Geatish-Swedish wars are spoken of in at least four different places in the dragon adventure, while in the first part of the poem there is only a slight allusion to Hygelac as the slayer of Ongentheow. The traditions of these wars are evidently Geatish for they are told from the Geats' point of view. It is interesting to note, that Beowulf plays no role in these struggles until the very end (2391-2395), when he assisted Eadgils. According to the poem, Beowulf did not participate during the strength of his youth. It was only in his "uferan dōgrum" that he gave assistance. The reason for this scanty and belated reference is plain. Beowulf, being a saga figure, never really took part in these wars at all, the connection being made later in story. This combination of saga and history is analogous to that in the *Nibelungen Lied*, in which historical tradition concerning the downfall of the Burgundians is interwoven with tales of the serpent-slayer Sigurd or Siegfried.

Judging from the minor episodes just discussed, it is clear that the Geats had a fairly large amount of saga material before the *Beowulf* epic was composed. It is also important to observe that the dragon part could stand by itself. Its independence is emphasised by the fact that it contains no allusions to the Angles, Saxons, or English, and only a passing remark about the Danes.

The Grendel and Grendelin portions of the epic are considered separately by Schück as to the character of their minor events. The episodes in the former fall into three groups, Danish, Danish-Friesian, and Germanic in general. The Germanic allusions are to the breast armor which was "Welandes geweorc" (455); the "Brōsinga mene" (1199); and the scop's comparison of Beowulf with Siegmund (875-897). The first two allusions are merely casual, and the poet perhaps did not have before him any definite lay or saga. The reference to Siegmund is probably based on some Germanic lay.

These three allusions to Germanic material are the only ones in the entire poem. A Danish-Frisian saga is presented in part in lines 1063-1159. The passages about Finn, which have no organic value in the epic, are to be considered Danish in origin, for the point of view is Danish. These references, like the Finnsburg fragment, are perhaps based on a collection of sagas or lays.

The third group of allusions deals with purely Danish material. The references to Heremod (898-913), which occur also in the Grendelin part (1709-1722), are apparently based on Danish lays. That the allusion to the coming of Scyld is based on Danish tradition is corroborated by Saxo's allusion.

The Grendelin part contains two allusions and two episodes. A reference to Heremod has been mentioned above. The future strife between Hrothgar and his nephew Hrolf Kraki is referred to in 1163-1165. Hrolf Kraki's enemy Hjorvard (Heorowearð) is mentioned in 2158-2161. An earlier allusion to the same strife was made in 81-85. Hence it appears, that the Anglo-Saxon poet knew the Danish sagas about Hrolf Kraki. The two episodes appear in "Beowulf's Return," a section of the epic which is doubtless original with the poet. The first narrates of the animosity between the Danes and the Heathobards (2032-2069). This has no direct bearing on the career of the hero, but the poet, mindful of some Danish tradition, has simply added this to the Danish lore already found in the Grendel-Grendelin saga. The second episode is based on the Offa saga (1931-1962). Schück thinks that Thryth was the wife of Offa II, Quendrida, or Cynethryth, who died in 796. This late date, with the fact that the introduction of the episode is abrupt and insufficiently motivated, leads him to conclude that the Thryth allusion is an interpolation after the poem was composed.

Schück's hypothesis that the Grendel hero and the Grendelin hero were originally different persons is at this point spun a little finer. He observes that the first was a land hero and the second a sea hero. Consequently when the first boasts of killing "niceras" (422), and of his race with Breca (499-581), he is alluding to sea exploits, and such allusions ought naturally to appear in the Grendelin portion. Hence Schück infers that the two heroes were combined early in Danish tradition and before this material reached the *Beowulf* poet.¹

The above examination of the heroes, the motifs, and the minor episodes and allusions in *Beowulf*, results in the conclusion that the Grendel-Grendelin saga was Danish, and that

¹ Why not infer from this evidence, thin as it is, that there never was more than one hero, and that he was amphibious in prowess?

around it were grouped a number of Danish sagas appearing in the corresponding part of the epic as episodes and allusions, and that the Geatish dragon saga was surrounded by a group of Geatish sagas which appear in the last part of the epic in a similar way, one saga cycle having grown up in Denmark and the other in Geatland. But in each of these main parts of the epic there is one saga that has its setting in Friesland. The first tells of the Finnsburg fight, the second, of the raid of Hygelac. One episode is told from the Danish, and the other, from the Geatish point of view, and neither from a Frisian point of view. This fact—that both poems (i. e. saga cycles) are set partly in Friesland—can hardly be a coincidence.¹ Upon this fact Professor Schück builds his theory, which he shares with Johannes Steenstrup, that the sagas reached England via Friesland.

There is evidence, says Schück, that the Northern countries had military and commercial relations with Friesland. Hygelac made his raid about 512. About 570 Venantius Fortunatus describes a combined expedition of Danes and Saxons into Friesland. And the poems tell of the fight at Finnsburg. That the road of commerce between Scandinavia and Southern Europe lay through Friesland is very probable because of this country's geographical location. In the *Vita Ansgarii* we have definite evidence that Dursteede was an important station on this road. The relations between England and Friesland, on the other hand, were mainly ecclesiastical. Bishop Wilfrid of York came over in 678, and other English missionaries followed him, among them St. Boniface.

Now, having argued that the Beowulf material existed in two separate cycles of sagas, one Danish, and one Geatish; having inferred a Frisian nativity of the epic, and having presented evidence that Danish, as well as Geatish warriors and merchants frequented Friesland, where according to history they might have met Englishmen, Professor Schück arrives at the conclusion that an English traveller had associated with these merchants, who were great story-tellers, and that, being impressed by the Grendel episode in one cycle and the dragon episode on the other, he combined the two into an epic. The young hero Beow was thus combined with the old hero Wulf. The Danish episodes and allusions, though somewhat obscured, kept their positions in the Beow part of the story, and the Geatish episodes and allusions similarly kept their place in the Wulf part of the story. The new hero Beowulf had to return to Geatland for his final deeds of prowess, so

¹ The translation of this passage is literal. I find no mention of other evidence from which Professor Schück might infer that the poem was composed in Friesland.

the Englishman composed the portion of the poem narrating that return. It might even be conjectured that the poet was the first to make the Grendel hero a Geat. For in the original Grendel story it was necessary only that the hero be a stranger.

The non-Scandinavian material in *Beowulf* is the allusions to Hama, Weland, and Siegmund. The poet may have got these either from England or from German merchants in Friesland. A detail of the poem, probably original with the poet, is the messenger's foreboding of hostility towards the Geats on the part of the Franks and Frisians. Such a fear would not naturally arise in the saga material of the North. Aside from these additions, the English redactor kept fairly close to his material. He emphasized certain episodes and subordinated others, but the general arrangement in two groups was adhered to. There is an almost total absence of cross reference, and the poem as it stands contains the Danish elements in one section and the Geatish in the other.

The foregoing summary indicates the main outlines of Professor Schück's argument. His theory is striking in its originality and its boldness, and it is presented with a good deal of effectiveness. Various objections will occur to the reader, one or two of which have been indicated in the foot-notes. But even if this ingenious hypothesis cannot stand, the general discussion and many suggestive details will prove to be of real service in the criticism of the poem.

VICTOR OSCAR FREEBURG.

College of the City of New York.

THE STAGE HISTORY OF SHAKESPEARE'S KING
RICHARD THE THIRD, by Alice I. Perry Wood. Pp.
186. New York, The Columbia University Press, 1909.

In the preface to this monograph Dr. Wood expressly rules out of her province discussions of text, date, and authorship, and confines the inquiry solely to tracing the fortunes of *Richard the Third* upon the stage. The wisdom of excluding problems of text and date from independent investigation, is questionable. The early history of this drama and its relationship to contemporary plays, as well as echoes and imitations of its lines by later writers, can scarcely be interpreted without some fairly definite assumptions as to the exact date of composition, and the authority of the Folio text as opposed to the Quarto. But in the present state of Shakespearian knowledge, these last two questions are far from settlement.

Dr. Wood's method of relating the *Richard* to contemporary dramas is not to seek for new sources, but to analyze